UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/527,414	11/09/2006	Todd Campbell	PA1211	4776
/-	7590 05/26/201 VASCULAR, INC.	0	EXAMINER	
IP LEGAL DEI	PARTMENT	MEDWAY, SCOTT J		
3576 UNOCAL PLACE SANTA ROSA, CA 95403			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3763	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			05/26/2010	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

rs.vasciplegal@medtronic.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/527,414	CAMPBELL, TODD		
Examiner	Art Unit		
SCOTT MEDWAY	3763		

	SCOTT MEDWAY	3763	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the o	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>08 May 2010</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APP	LICATION IN CONDITION FOR AL	LOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appelor Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 Coperiods:	replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit eal (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this A no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire to Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(1)	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in ater than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE	date of the final rejection	n.
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extunder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	ension and the corresponding amount of shortened statutory period for reply origing than three months after the mailing date	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Office	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
 The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in comp filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exter Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS 	nsion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be a considered and amendment (a). They raise new issues that would require further core (b). They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below (c). They are not deemed to place the application in beta appeal; and/or (d). They present additional claims without canceling a considered and the co	nsideration and/or search (see NOTw); ter form for appeal by materially rec corresponding number of finally reje	E below); ducing or simplifying th	
NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.1 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all	21. See attached Notice of Non-Con		
non-allowable claim(s). 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE		l be entered and an e:	xplanation of
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to o showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary. 10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An evalencial of the offidavit or other evidence is entered.	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea and was not earlier presented. Se	ll and/or appellant fails ee 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1)	s to provide a).
 The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation <u>REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER</u> The request for reconsideration has been considered but 		•	
See Continuation Sheet.			
 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u>. 	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/Nicholas D Lucchesi/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 3763			

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Claims 26-31 are newly added, but a corresponding number of finally rejected claims was not canceled.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments with respect to the claims are not found persuasive. Responding to Applicant's argument that the reference of Siepmann cannot be combined with the reference of Kamath because the reference of Siepmann discloses a preferred model involving tablets, Examiner asserts that Siepmann clearly discloses that such a method may be applied to polymers. Since Kamath also discloses the use of polymers, it is Examiner's assertion that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have recognized that the method taught by Siepmann for use with polymers could be applied to the polymers disclosed by Kamath with a reasonable expectation of success in arriving at the claimed invention and the improvement set forth in the Office Action mailed 03/17/2010.

Continuation of 13. Other: Examiner notes, for benefit of Applicant, that the amended limitation "said polymer layer" appearing in claim 1 is unclear because it is not known to which polymer layer "said polymer layer" is referring (claim 1 recites "at least two polymer layers"). Such a limitation, if filed in a Request for Continued Examinaton, could warrant a 35 U.S.C. sec. 112 rejection at least on the basis that the amended limitation is indefinite.